

Amend Section 300
Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR)
Re: Upland Game Birds

This Initial Statement of Reasons is intended to reduce any potential impact hunting may have on these populations by allowing managers more flexibility in the number of permits issued. The current number of permits allowed for each of the four zones would remain as the highest limit of a range starting at zero.

- (b) Authority and Reference Sections from Fish and Game Code for Regulation:

Authority: Sections 200, 202, 203 and 355, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 215, 220, 355 and 356, Fish and Game Code.

- (c) Specific Technology or Equipment Required by Regulatory Change:

None.

- (d) Identification of Reports or Documents Supporting Regulation Change:

Draft Environmental Document regarding Resident Game Bird Hunting, May 21, 2004

12-Month Findings for Petitions to List the Greater Sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) as Threatened or Endangered; Notice of 12-Month Petition Findings. 75 Federal Register 43 (5 March 2010).

- (e) Public Discussions of Proposed Regulations Prior to Notice Publication:

None.

IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

- (a) Alternatives to Proposed Project

1) Eliminate all permits for hunting sage-grouse. Very few permits are currently issued, and total take may not be of any significance to population numbers. This would result in the decrease hunter opportunity.

2) Reduce the number of permits. A lower limit on the number of permits issued would eliminate the Commission's ability to allow for more hunter opportunity when populations can support more take.

- (b) No Change Alternative:

1) The “no change” alternative would maintain the current number of permits issued for sage grouse and could potentially add to mortalities experienced by those populations if population numbers continue to decrease.

(c) Consideration of Alternatives:

No alternative would be more effective at resolving the issue than the proposed alternative.

V. Mitigation Measures required by the Regulatory Action:

The proposed regulatory action will have no significant impact on the environment; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

VI. Impact of Regulatory Action:

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations regarding the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The Department does not believe that the proposed action will have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California:

The Department does not believe that the proposed action will have a significant adverse economic impact directly affecting the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Department does not believe that the proposed action will have a significant adverse affect on costs for private persons or

businesses

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None

- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None

- (g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4:

None

- (h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The existing regulations provide a general hunting season for taking resident upland game birds. Subsection 300(a)(1)(D) provides for general season hunting of sage grouse in Lassen, Mono and Inyo counties. A limited number of permits are issued annually.

The proposed regulation is intended to reduce any potential impact hunting may have on these populations by providing options for the Fish and Game Commission to select the number of permits issued for greater sage grouse.